



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,159	05/03/2006	Sergio Gramer-Quinonez	GRAMER I	5791
1444 7590 01/20/2010 BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303				
EXAMINER				
HAUGHTON, ANTHONY MICHAEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2835				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/20/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/541,159

**Applicant(s)**

GRAMER-QUINONEZ ET AL.

**Examiner**

ANTHONY M. HAUGHTON

**Art Unit**

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2009 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI.08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/30/2005

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Objections*

1. **Claim 6** is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 6 has multiple periods throughout the claim making it formed of multiple sentences when a claim must be only 1 sentence. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. **Claims 4, 6-13, and 17** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. **Claim 4** recites the limitation "the processor" in line 2 of the claim, and "the internal hard disk" on lines 3-4 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. **Claims 6-9** are unclear to the examiner and it is not known what is trying to be claimed. There is no clear picture of these elements in the drawings or specification and the examiner respectfully notes that these claims are deemed unclear and shall be corrected.
6. **Claims 10-13** all recites the limitation "the transportation vehicles" in line 2 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. **Claim 17** recites the limitation "the instruments board" in lines 2-3 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 4, 5, and 14-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki (6,504,529) and in further view of Silverman (6,501,644).

**Regarding Claim 4:** Inagaki teaches a videocomputer, which comprises a computer (fig. 3); a double ventilation unit (25 and 29), one for the processor and one for a mother board (fig. 3); a connection device to connect an extractable hard disk (fig. 3); a remote control power switch (112) connected to a keyboard panel; at least one audio and video output port (figs. 10-12), one serial port (figs. 10-12), one PS2 port (figs. 10-12) to connect a keyboard and two USB ports (figs. 10-12); and a power supply(107), but lacks a clear teaching of a shock absorbing device in the base of the internal hard disk, the shock absorbing device comprised of rubber plates placed at points susceptible of movement or vibration to absorb the impact from a movement that could cause malfunctioning thereof.

Silverman teaches a portable laptop device (fig. 2A) with a shock absorbing device (46, 48, 50) in the base of the internal hard disk (fig. 1), the shock absorbing device comprised of rubber plates placed at points susceptible of movement or vibration to absorb the impact from a movement that could cause malfunctioning thereof (col. 4 lines 21-25).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Inagaki by adding shock absorbing pads as disclosed by Silverman, since this would increase the durability of the hard disk drive in the computer system decreasing the chance of damage occurring to the drive.

**Regarding Claim 5:** Inagaki lacks a specific teaching of the computer having a minimum storage capacity for 180 hours of audio and video in the hard disk, 256 Mega Bytes RAM and at least a Pentium 4 processor or equivalent to 1.7 Giga Hertz.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Inagaki by adding the specific valued computer elements of the claim, since this is merely the size and capacity of the physical elements of the computer system where all of the elements are disclosed by the prior art and this would simply be up to the choice of the user based upon the intended use of the product.

**Regarding Claim 14:** Inagaki teaches a keyboard in the operator's area of action, for controlling the videocomputer operation (figs. 2-3).

**Regarding Claim 15:** Inagaki teaches a screen connected to the videocomputer's computer via a serial, parallel, or any other port for data transfer, and powered by the computer or by other source of energy (fig. 6).

**Regarding Claim 16:** Inagaki teaches the screen being integrated to the keyboard placed in the operator's area of action (fig. 6).

**Regarding Claim 17:** Inagaki teaches the screen being separated to the keyboard integrated to the instruments board or in some visible place for the operator (fig. 22).

**Regarding Claim 18:** Inagaki teaches a remote control power on-off switch integrated to the keyboard (112).

10. **Claims 10-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki (6,504,529) in further view of Silverman (6,501,644) as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Kurnia (6,411,534).

**Regarding Claim 10:** Inagaki and Silverman lack a clear teaching of the power supply being generated through the transportation vehicle's power supply generating 24 volts, requiring the usage of a power transformer with a 24-volt input and a 12-volt output followed by a power inverter with a 12-volt input and a 110- volt output.

Kurnia teaches controls for operating a power converter circuit (abstract) which is made by the use of a power transformer and power inverter (fig. 2) as well as the use of the converter in an automobile (technical field second).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Inagaki in view of Silverman by adding a power converter circuit as disclosed by Kurnia, since this would allow flexibility of the user to have the electronic device and use it in an automobile giving a greater range as to where the user can use the device, while the specific values of the transformers and inverters are up to the choice of the user.

**Regarding Claim 11:** Inagaki and Silverman lack a clear teaching of the power supply being generated through the transportation vehicle's power supply generating 12 volts, requiring a power inverter with a 12-volt input and a 110-volt output.

Kurnia teaches controls for operating a power converter circuit (abstract) which is made by the use of a power transformer and power inverter (fig. 2) as well as the use of the converter in an automobile (technical field second).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Inagaki in view of Silverman by adding a power converter circuit as disclosed by Kurnia, since this would allow flexibility of the user to have the electronic device and use it in an automobile giving a greater range as to where the user can use the device, while the specific values of the transformers and inverters are up to the choice of the user.

**Regarding Claim 12:** Inagaki and Silverman lack a clear teaching of the power supply being generated through the transportation vehicle's power supply generating 24 volts, requiring a power inverter with a 24-volt input and a 110-volt output.

Kurnia teaches controls for operating a power converter circuit (abstract) which is made by the use of a power transformer and power inverter (fig. 2) as well as the use of the converter in an automobile (technical field second).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Inagaki in view of Silverman by adding a power converter circuit as disclosed by Kurnia, since this would allow flexibility of the user to have the electronic device and use it in an automobile giving a greater range as to where the user can use the device, while the specific values of the transformers and inverters are up to the choice of the user.

**Regarding Claim 13:** Inagaki and Silverman lack a clear teaching of the power supply being generated through the transportation vehicle's power supply generating 24 or 12 volts.

Kurnia teaches controls for operating a power converter circuit (abstract) which is made by the use of a power transformer and power inverter (fig. 2) as well as the use of the converter in an automobile (technical field second).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Inagaki in view of Silverman by adding a power converter circuit as disclosed by Kurnia, since this would allow flexibility of the user to have the electronic device and use it in an automobile giving a greater range as to where the user can use the device, while the specific values of the transformers and inverters are up to the choice of the user.

11. **Claim 19** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inagaki (6,504,529), and in further view of Komatsu (5,796,580).

**Regarding Claim 19:** Inagaki teaches a videocomputer comprising a computer (11), a software (inherent element of a computer in order for it to work), a hard disk (14), an extractable hard disk drive (15), a video cable (151), a sound amplifier (24s), wherein the videocomputer's computer hard disk will be fed with compressed digital image and sound files through the extractable hard disk drive previously fed (this is a functionality and holds no patentable weight in the structure of the apparatus see MPEP 2114), a data transfer via wire network, wireless network or broad band internet (this is a functionality and holds no patentable weight in the structure of the apparatus see MPEP

2114), USB port (60) or any other kind of port with the capability of connecting to a portable hard disk; said computer processes the information stored in the hard disk, transforming it into video signal, which is sent via a video cable to a signal splitter which multiplies this video signal to send it to several monitors or televisions placed in the interior of the transportation vehicle (this is a functionality and holds no patentable weight in the structure of the apparatus see MPEP 2114); said computer also processes the information, transforming it into an audio signal with stereo output, primarily directed to an audio filter, which has the function of eliminating the noise produced by external agents, sending the cleaned signal to a sound amplifier which distributes it to the loudspeakers in the transportation vehicle (this is a functionality and holds no patentable weight in the structure of the apparatus see MPEP 2114); and wherein the projection of the digital images and sound is coordinated by the software in accordance to the pre-established routes, running time and exhibition times in the passenger transportation (this is a functionality and holds no patentable weight in the structure of the apparatus see MPEP 2114), but lacks a clear teaching of a signal splitter or an audio filter.

Komatsu teaches the use of an audio filter (111) in an electronic computer system.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus by adding an audio filter as disclosed by Komatsu, since this would decrease the noise produced over the signal lines and create and more clear crisp sound coming from the sound amplifiers.

It also would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus by adding a signal splitter as this is merely duplication the already disclosed signal lines to make multiple lines, and it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY M. HAUGHTON whose telephone number is (571)272-9087. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 - 6:00 EST Tuesdays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash N. Gandhi can be reached on 571-272-3740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 2835

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/AMH/

/Jayprakash N Gandhi/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2835